

Dear Chair Gelser and Members of the Senate Human Services Committee,

I am writing to urge you to oppose SB 669. SB 669 is ill conceived and ill considered. It would injure those whom it purports to help, seniors and the caregivers providing supportive services to them.

I am a resident of Clackamas County and the owner of an In Home Care agency that serves Multnomah and Clackamas County residents. I attended the March 26, 2019 public hearing on SB 669 and signed up to speak. Unfortunately, testimony was cut off prior to my being called to speak. I did submit written testimony that address substantive issues of concern regarding SB 669. My comments contained therein stand. My comments today are supplemental to my earlier written testimony and are focused on my concerns related to the process of drafting and considering SB 669. I had hoped to testify in person, but am home sick today and thus submit my comments in writing.

SB 669 appears to have been written by SEIU, which represents Home Care Workers in the Oregon Home Care Commission Registry program. The bill and testimony provided by SEIU reveals little understanding of the comprehensive regulations governing In Home Care Agencies already in place that are administered by the Oregon Health Authority's Health Care Regulation and Quality Improvement (HCRQI) Program.

The Oregon State Audit (2019-05) of the Department of Human Services Adult and People with Disabilities Division and the Oregon Home Care Commission revealed significant problems with Home Care Worker training, competency monitoring, problems that may endanger those served by the program. SB 669 does not significantly address these problems, rather it targets in home care agencies that are already licensed and monitored by the Oregon Health Authority.

While I am sympathetic with the Home Care Workers who shared their stories of legitimate concerns on March 26. SB 669 does little to address their concerns:

- Wage Theft is enforced by BOLI – concerns about wage theft should be addressed through the enforcement regulations in place. SB 669 would appear to authorize DHS to close agencies which were accused of wage theft resulting in the employee making the complaint losing their job, rather than ensuring the employer complies with wage laws.
- Training Standards and Competency Evaluation is already a requirement for In Home Care agencies that are licensed by OHA. The HCRQI already has a process for receiving and investigating complaints. Making In Home Care agencies subject to the same, incomplete and problem riddled training program for DHS Home Care Workers moves the state of care backwards.
- Payday loans are already regulated by the Oregon Division of Financial Regulation. Concerns about predatory lending should be directed there. DHS should not be asked to provide duplicative enforcement of these rules.

Finally, I would like to say that I have been distressed by parts of the process by which the Human Services Committee has thus far considered SB 669. It was distressing to have traveled to Salem to testify at the March 26 hearing, see 14 people sign up to testify, and watch while the proponents of the legislation were given unlimited time to voice their support, while those in opposition either had their testimony cut short or were not allowed to speak. While I understand the Committee only had 30 minutes scheduled to hear testimony on SB 669, fairness would have dictated that each speaker be given 2 minutes to speak. It is also troubling that, unlike for the hearing on SB 832 where there were

representatives from the spectrum of agencies impacted by the legislation who were involved in the drafting of the legislation, SB 669 was drafted by a special interest group, with no input from either the existing regulatory authority (the OHA) or from those impacted by legislation (the 150+ In Home Care Agencies, their employees and clients). Legislation such as SB 669 with significant impacts on at risk populations, businesses and non-profits serving them, and their employees, should not be enacted without first developing a forum to engage the broad spectrum of stakeholders in a process of considering the issues and having the opportunity to provide their input.

SB 669 is bad legislation. I urge the committee to oppose SB 669.

Thank you for considering my perspective.

Respectfully submitted,

Robb Courtney